

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on September 1, 2006.

Claims 1 and 11-16 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-16 are now pending in this application.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicants' remarks concerning the claims will be presented in the same order in which the Examiner presented them in the Office Action.

Amendments to Claims 1 and 11-16

Claims 1 and 11-16 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim 1 has been amended by deleting “substantially”.

Independent claim 11 has been amended by substituting “electronic module” for “apparatus”, adding “ends of” and “and to maintain the ends thereof substantially in the same plane”, and deleting “at a substantially flat interface”.

Support for “electronic module” may be found, for example, at page 4, line 20 of the original application.

Support for “and to maintain the ends thereof substantially in the same plane” may be found, for example, at page 3, lines 18-20 of the original application.

Claims 12-16 have been amended by substituting “electronic module” for “apparatus”.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended for compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claim 1 has been amended by deleting “substantially”.

Independent claim 11 has been amended by adding “ends of” and “and to maintain the ends thereof substantially in the same plane”, and deleting “at a substantially flat interface”.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Accordingly, claims 11-16 have been amended for compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In independent claim 11 and dependent claims 12-16, the preamble has been amended from an “apparatus” to an “electronic module”. Applicants have respectfully considered the Examiner’s suggestion to use “system” in the preamble of claims 11-16. However, Applicants prefer “electronic module”, support for which may be found, for example, at page 4, lines 20-24 of the original application. This passage specifically mentions the same elements as recited in claim 11, namely an “alignment weight”, a “circuit board”, and “pins”.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney, Ann M. McCrackin (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) at (612) 349-9592 or Applicants' below-signed attorney (located in Phoenix, Arizona) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

CHERYL M. WALDRON-FLOYDE ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(602) 298-8920

By / Walter W. Nielsen /
Walter W. Nielsen
Reg. No. 25,539